



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of the Lord's Supper:—"HIC EST ENIM CALIX SANGUinis MEI, NOVI ET AETERNI testamenti; MYSTERIUM FIDEI; qui pro nobis ET PRO MULTIS EFFUNDETUR IN REMISsione PECCATORUM."

In this latter case it will be at once perceived that no less than three words are foisted in, viz.:—*eterni* and *mysterium fidei*. It is hard to conceive what were the inducements which led to the introduction of *enim* in the case of the wafer. Equally difficult it is to conjecture the imagined utility of the term *eterni* in the latter falsification of Scripture. The one is positively useless, the other incorrect, and, indeed, false likewise. We can imagine the reasons which led to the interpolation of the words *mysterium fidei*, as throwing an air of mystery over what our Lord designed to be the farthest removed from such. But, on the whole, we appeal to any candid person, whether or not, in the most essential parts of this sacramental ordinance, the Church of Rome has not taken on herself to interpolate words of her own into the words of institution used by our blessed Lord Himself, without reason or authority.

So much for the CURIOSITIES OF THE MASS.

SALE OF MASSES.

In our correspondence columns, a couple of months ago, a subject was touched on which well deserves a little fuller development—we mean the difficulties felt by Protestants in reconciling the theory and practice of the Church of Rome concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass. The Church of Rome maintains, as is well known, that in the Mass there is offered up to God the same sacrifice as that made on Calvary, the infinitely precious body and blood of our blessed Lord; yet the effects of this sacrifice do not correspond to what might have been expected to result from an offering so unspeakably valuable. It does not even suffice to ensure the release of a single soul from purgatory, and for the same soul Mass after Mass is offered without any certainty of their having had the wished-for effect; and that although the souls in purgatory can place no obstacle on their part to their release. Further, what seems to Protestant minds still more inconsistent with the Romish theory as to the Sacrifice of the Mass, is the prevalent practice of *selling* of Masses. For many centuries this practice has been a fruitful source of scandals in the Church; and history records vain efforts of councils, constantly renewed, to check those abuses, to put bounds to the avarice of the priests, and to prevent them from making the Holy Sacrifice a matter of bargain and sale. Is it possible to think that the priests who acted thus believed the doctrine they professed, or that they really thought that the thing in which they trafficked was nothing less than the body and blood of their Saviour? The following passage, cited from a writer of the 12th century, by Pope Benedict XIV., in his book on the Mass, appears to say nothing more than the literal truth:—"We sell Christ more disgracefully than Judas did, for he sold one whom he believed to be an innocent man; we sell one whom we believe to be God and man. He sold Him for thirty pieces of silver; we, for a much smaller sum of money; he repented and brought back the thirty pieces of silver, but there is not one of us who thinks of giving back what he has so disgracefully acquired."

When things, too, are sold for money, how is it possible not to put a money value on them? and, as was said in a former number, how can anything be said to be of infinite value if you can buy it for half a crown?

Further, this most sacred object is applied to the lowest and most ignoble purposes; and it is a common thing to have a Mass said to cure a sick horse or a sick cow, to procure a good take of herrings, or some earthly blessing of no greater value. Protestants find it hard to understand that with no higher object priests perform what they believe to be the most stupendous miracle of their religion, and by a word bring down the Creator of heaven and earth and offer Him anew in sacrifice to the Father.

Another difficulty presented by the usages of the Roman Catholic Church on this subject is, the very unfavourable position in which a poor man is placed in comparison with a rich man. While the latter may bequeath money without end to provide Masses for the release of his soul from purgatory, and can in like manner bestow money to obtain a similar benefit for the souls of his family, the poor man is left to linger in torment for the want of Masses to obtain his release; and he suffers from the want of money, not only in this life, but in the world to come. These are some of the difficulties which a Protestant feels in understanding the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Mass, and we, therefore, think that some of our readers will be glad if we set before them the explanations which Roman Catholic divines themselves give of their Church's doctrine on this subject; if we tell how they account for the origin of priests taking money for their performance of the highest function of their office, and if we give some specimens of the questions to which this practice has given rise. Our materials are taken from approved Roman Catholic theologians—[viz., principally the theology of Peter Dens, and the treatise on the Mass of Pope Benedict XIV.,] and we add, but sparingly, comments of our own. We are, consequently, obliged to be a little dry and scholastic, but we shall try not to be more so than the nature of the case forces us to be.

First, then, with respect to the value of the sacrifice

of the Mass, and whether it be infinite or not, the following is the decision of Roman Catholic theologians:—As to the substance of the sacrifice, it is of infinite value, for it is identical as to substance with the sacrifice of the Cross, which is of infinite sufficiency; so that no limit whatsoever can be placed to the benefits which may be obtained by its means, or to the satisfaction for punishment which it is able to effect. But as to its actual efficiency it must be acknowledged that the value of the sacrifice is finite, and the sufficient proof of this is the practice of the Church, in which it has been common to repeat the sacrifice several times for obtaining a single blessing, such as the release of a soul from purgatory. Moreover, that the value is finite is proved by the practice of offering sacrifice for one soul in particular. For if the sacrifice were of infinite value and efficacy it might be offered at once for all souls in general, and the individual soul would derive equal benefit. The practice of offering for individuals proves that the sacrifice is a finite thing, which, when divided among several, does not afford as large a portion for each as it one had it all to himself. In like manner, priests are not allowed to take money from different people for offering the same Mass, which proves that the Church felt that the benefit received could not be the same when the fruits of the Mass are divided between two or more as when given to one alone. The reason assigned for this limitation of the fruits of the Mass is the wish of Christ that it should be constantly repeated, which would be needless if one Mass were of infinite efficacy.

We subscribe to the cogency of the reasons by which Roman Catholic divines prove, as above, that the sacrifice of the Mass is of finite efficacy; but we think also that this fact proves very decisively that the Mass is not identical with the sacrifice made on Calvary, which was of infinite efficacy, which, as the Apostle tells us in the Epistle to the Hebrews, needed not to be repeated, and which was as effectual when offered for the sins of the whole world as if it had been offered for one alone.

We return to explain the Roman Catholic account of the effects of the sacrifice of the Mass. These effects are commonly divided into two principal classes—satisfactory and impetratory: the former having reference to its power in obtaining remission of punishment for sin; the latter in reference to its power in obtaining temporal or spiritual blessings. These effects, again, are divided into three parts—a general, special, and most special. The "general" part is that which belongs to the whole Church; for the canon of the Mass contains prayers for the entire Church, and a priest would be deserving of grave censure who, from ill-will or any other motive, should designedly exclude any member of the Church from his application of the sacrifice. The second portion is "special," and belongs to those for whom the priest intends specially to sacrifice. It is for their application of this portion of the benefits of their Mass that priests have been in the habit of receiving money. The third, or "most special," portion is that which belongs to the priest himself, in accordance with the text in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which declares that a priest must first offer for his own sins; then for those of the people.

Now, it will be seen that it is with respect to the second of these portions that the principal question turns as to the sale of Masses—may a priest take money for his application of this portion of the fruits of his Mass to one rather than to another. This question, as we before said, is answered by Roman Catholic divines in the affirmative; the main burden of the proof falling on the custom of the Church, in which such taking of money has been practised now for many years; and it is held to be rash to find fault with the custom of the Church.

But how is the objection to be answered that this is to sell Christ and to put a price upon what is of infinite value? The reader of Pascal's Provincial Letters, who has learned from him the excellent device of "directing the intention," will be at no loss how to answer this question. "To convince you," says the Jesuit Father in the Provincial Letters, "that everything is not allowed, we do not allow of any one committing sin with a deliberate purpose to do so; and if a person persists in sin, having no other end in transgression than the sin itself, we break with him. Such conduct is diabolical, without distinction of age, sex, or condition. But if such be not the unhappy condition of the party, we endeavour to put in practice our method of 'directing the intention,' which consists in proposing for the act committed a lawful motive and object. As far as in our power, we turn men aside from forbidden courses; but when we cannot prevent the act we, at least, purify the intention, and thus correct the viciousness of the means by the goodness of the end." Thus, for instance, it is held to be unlawful to strike or kill a man who has insulted you, if you do it with an intention of *avenging yourself*, which is forbidden; but the act is lawful if done with an intention of *defending your honour*, which is innocent and praiseworthy. So, in like manner, an incumbent may desire the death of a person who enjoys an annuity out of his benefice, but his motive must not on any account be hatred of the annuitant, but only desire of the temporal gain resulting. And, to come more closely to the point, to take money as the price of a spiritual benefit—for instance, in exchange for a benefice—is palpable simony; but if the money be

given as the *motive* which shall attract the good will of the patron to confer the preferment in question, then it is not simony, even though the money be the principal consideration with the presenter. "In this way," continues the Jesuit Father, "we exclude numerous cases of simony; for who would be so unprincipled, so abandoned in the sight of God, as to persist in giving money as the *price* of his preferment, when he might obtain the same preferment by giving the money merely as a *motive* to attract the good will of the patron."

Now, we are far from charging on the Church of Rome at large all the extravagant doctrines which Pascal found in the teaching of some Jesuit divines; but the approved solution of the difficulty we are considering differs in no essential point from this accommodating teaching on the subject of simony. The decision of St. Thomas Aquinas is, that a priest cannot take money as the price of his consecration of his Eucharist, for that would be flat simony; but he may take the money as stipend for his support—"non quasi pretium missae sed quasi sustentum vite." Thus, all inducement to simony is removed; for, as the essential point is left untouched, namely, that a priest is at liberty to apply the sacrifice to the special benefit of individuals in case they pay him, and otherwise not, what priest, we may ask in Pascal's words, would be so abandoned in the sight of God as to incur the guilt of simony, by regarding the money he took as the price of the sacrifice, when he might pocket it innocently as mere pay for his support. Evidently the sale of benefices or other spiritual things would become justifiable by the same rule, if the patron were careful to take the money in *sustentum vite*, and by no means as the *price* of the benefice. Notwithstanding this explanation, then, we advisedly use the expression, "Sale," in speaking of Masses, because we think that a transaction where, by giving money, a person acquires something which he would not have obtained if he had not given the money, can only be accurately described as a case of purchase and sale. The phrase, "Sale of Masses," is not quite so accurate, and is only used for brevity, the thing bought not being the entire Mass, great part of the benefits of which is common to the entire Church, but only the application of the "special" portion of these benefits described above. Indirectly, indeed, even the first of these benefits may be acquired by money, since it might happen that the Mass would not have been said at all if not paid for."

We come now to the second difficulty: Does not the practice of conferring these fruits of the Mass on those only who pay for them give a great advantage to the rich over the poor? Thus, St. Thomas Aquinas proposes a similar difficulty as follows:—"So many suffrages are not offered for the poor as for the rich. If, then, the suffrages offered for any profit them more than others, the poor will be in a worse condition than the rich, contrary to the words of St. Luke, 'Blessed are ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of Heaven.' The solution given by Thomas Aquinas in substance comes to this, that the promise in St. Luke only applies to Heaven, and not a word in it is said about Purgatory. Every one knows that in temporal matters the poor are in a worse condition than the rich, and there is nothing to prevent their being also in a worse condition than the rich with regard to the expiating the temporal sufferings for their sins; but this is nothing in comparison with heaven, with regard to the attainment of which the words of St. Luke above cited show that the poor are in a better condition than the rich.^a Lest the rich, however, should be discouraged by this statement, Pope Benedict XIV., in quoting the above passage from Thomas Aquinas, adds, that the rich can easily get over this difficulty about their admission into heaven, if they make a good use of their money by giving alms to the living, having Masses said for the dead, and so forth. And in practice, we nowhere find that rich Roman Catholics are alarmed with the danger of going to a place where Masses cannot profit them; all seem fully impressed with the belief that purgatory is the worst thing that can happen them, and, fortunately, that is a place where money has not lost its value.

Having disposed of these preliminary difficulties, we come next to speak of the origin of the selling of Masses. In the primitive Church it was customary for the members of the congregation to contribute the bread and wine out of which the Eucharist was consecrated, and their liberality far surpassed the wants of the actual service of the Church, so that there was always a large surplus of these oblations, which was used for the sustenance of the clergy. In process of time the practice of making these oblations *in kind* was discontinued, and gifts of money substituted. In the primitive Church, however, these gifts were made to the Church and clergy generally; and, according to the learned Benedictine, Mabillon, it was not till the eighth century that the opposite practice was introduced, namely, that of

^a With respect to the text, "The labourer is worthy of his hire," and the other passages in which St. Paul proves the right of a Christian clergy to a maintenance from their flocks, they seem to be quite inapplicable when brought forward to justify the sale of Masses. The right of the clergy to a maintenance is undoubtedly; but they ought not to be either driven or permitted to get their living by making a market of holy things.

^b Ad tertium dicendum, quod nihil prohibet divites quantum ad aliquid esse melioris conditionis quam pauperes sicut quantum ad expiationem peccata; sed hoc quasi nihil est comparatum possessio Regni colorum in quam pauperes melioris conditionis esse ostenduntur per auctoritatem inducuntur."

bestowing the stipend on the priest who performed the Mass, nor did this practice become general till the twelfth century.

When it became firmly established it became one of the most fruitful sources of gain for the clergy. The torments of purgatory were held forth in terror over the people. Masses were represented as the most efficacious means of obtaining a release from these torments; and so an immense demand for Masses arose—the selfish bequeathing abundance of such Masses to be said for themselves, the loving and affectionate procuring them for their departed friends. It was not in human nature that such a fruitful source of gain should not be turned by avaricious men to a thousand abuses, and, accordingly, Church history is full of struggles, which would be highly amusing if the subject were not so sacred, between priests, tempted by filthy lucre to make an undue harvest out of this source of revenue, and the higher authorities, who had a sense of the danger which would arise if by inordinate exactions men were made to abhor the offering of the Lord.

In the first place, it must be mentioned that by the rules of the Roman Catholic Church a priest can offer but one Mass in the day. There are some exceptions to this rule, into which we need not enter: the only one we care to mention being the case of Christmas day, on which three Masses may be offered. There was also a special exemption for Spain, allowing three Masses to be said on the feast of All Souls, but accompanied with a cruel condition that the priest should only take money for one of them. The reasons for this limitation in the number of Masses is not obvious, particularly as the offering up of the Mass is held to be the highest act of worship which can be offered to God. "The number of Masses tends so much to the glory of God," says Father Collot, cited by Pascal, "that there would not be too many priests, if not only all men and women (were it possible), but even inanimate bodies, and the very brute beasts, were changed into priests for the performance of Masses." One would suppose that to place a limit on the performance of an action tending so much to the glory of God would be objectionable. The reason given by Pope Alexander II. for forbidding the celebration of more Masses than one is that the celebration of a Mass is no trifling matter, and that a priest ought to count himself happy if he has worthily offered one Mass. This explanation, however, appears by no means to go to the bottom of the matter. Let it be granted that it is a difficult thing to find a priest who can worthily offer one Mass; but if such a one has been found, we see no reason why he who has, with worthy dispositions, offered one Mass, might not go on to offer another. Perhaps a truer explanation might be, that if priests were at liberty to offer as many Masses in the day as they pleased, their flocks would expect them to give for little or nothing a benefit which would be conferred with but moderate trouble to themselves. It is said that the Dutch, in the Spice Islands, cut down a large number of the trees, believing that if they had a larger supply of spices, they would only be obliged to sell them cheaper, so that their whole profit would not be increased; and they thought it saved them a great deal of trouble to gain their money by the sale of a small quantity at a high price, rather than of a large quantity at a low price. And, no doubt, if priests were allowed to offer Masses without limit their labour would be immensely increased, while it is doubtful if there would be much increase of emolument. This regulation limiting the number of Masses, though clearly for the real interests of the priests, is one which avaricious priests have attempted, in various ways, to evade. Covetous men have tried one scheme after another to get over the unpalatable rule which confined them to one fee in the day; and as they could offer only the one Mass, they tried at least to get paid twice over for that one. One plan was to consecrate as many hosts as there had been fees paid for the Mass, each host being thus intended for the benefit of each benefactor; but it has been ruled that the consecration of several hosts counts for no more than the consecration of one. Another scheme was what were called double-faced Masses. It will be remembered that the actual consecration is the only part of a Mass which it is unlawful to repeat; so the priests said the Mass up to the point of consecration; then commenced over again, and so on, as often times as they had received fees; then made one consecration; and then repeated the prayers subsequent to the consecration, as often as the commencing prayers. Another similar method was, after a first Mass in due form, to repeat a second *dry Mass*, which consisted in the prayers, omitting the consecration. Both these methods are rejected, because it is in the consecration that the whole virtue of the sacrifice consists; and where there are not two consecrations there is no claim for two fees.

The next plea for a double fee is more ingenious. It has been said before that the effects of the Mass are twofold, satisfactory and impetratory. Now, suppose one man wishes to have a Mass said for a soul in purgatory, for which purpose he only requires the satisfactory effects of the Mass; and another man wishes to obtain some temporal blessing, for which purpose he only requires the impetratory: why should not the priest take pay from both, dividing the effects of the Mass between them. This seems to us rather a good point, and we do not exactly know why it was not successful. The last device which we shall mention was even more remarkable. It has been mentioned that

beside the "special" portion of the fruits of the Mass, which are in ordinary course assigned to him who pays for the Mass, there is a "most special" portion, consisting of benefits to the soul of the priest himself who offers the Mass. St. Paul, in a passionate excess of charity, could even wish himself to be accursed from Christ, if by so doing he could procure the salvation of his brethren. Now, some priests, inspired by like fervour of charity, were willing to give up all advantages to be derived to their own souls from the Masses they performed, and to make over these advantages to their benefactors. Thus, having sold the special fruits of the Mass to one party, they felt themselves at liberty to make a new bargain, and make over the "most special" fruits to another. A doubt was raised whether this latter part was as valuable as the other, and, on the whole, the conclusion was come to that it was not; and the priest's own share has been estimated at one third part of the "special" fruit of the Mass, so that the amount taken from the second purchaser ought not, in fairness, to exceed one-third part of that received from the first. However, on mature deliberation, it seemed a doubtful question whether the "most special" part is transferable or not, and the practice of selling it has been condemned, because it is not honest to take money for an uncertainty.

One case where a double pay is allowed is worth mentioning. A priest is paid for saying Mass in a particular chape, for the convenience of the people; but no bargain has been made about the application of the special benefits of the sacrifice. Is he at liberty to receive a second stipend from those to whom he appropriates these special fruits? It is answered in the affirmative, because the priest here imposes on himself two distinct obligations, and may receive separate pay for each.

Another case we leave to our readers to solve. Suppose that a priest accepts an endowment, with the obligation of saying Mass every day for the soul of his founder, it is held that this is not to be construed absolutely *every* day, since it is not reasonable to suppose that the founder would object to the priest's having a few occasional holidays, and an interruption to the daily routine of Masses would enable him to return to his office with freshened feelings and highly increased devotion. Well, then, on those vacation days on which the founder has no reasonable claim on him, may not the poor priest take money for saying Masses for others, since thus the founder is no worse off than if the Mass had not been said at all, and the priest is decidedly better.

As we have happened to mention the case of foundations, we may as well say a word as to the similar case of monasteries. The priest of a parish church is bound to apply the benefits of his sacrifice to his parishioners on Sundays and all holidays of obligation; that is to say, those on which the people are bound to come and hear Mass: on other days he may dispose of his Mass as he pleases. In monasteries, again, the rule is, that one Mass be said every day for the benefactors of the institution. Now, Pope Benedict XIV. records some hard battles fought in his time by monasteries, upon which he endeavoured to enforce this regulation. Some urged energetically that *from time immemorial* they never had complied with this rule, but were met with the reply that a bad custom could not be legalized by length of time. Then they pleaded poverty, and declared that they could not live if they were deprived of this means of support by having their Masses devoted to dead benefactors, from whom no more money was to be got. And they succeeded in obtaining so much relaxation that they were allowed, where a good case of poverty was made out, to apply their week-day Masses to the best advantage; but the Masses on Sundays and holidays must in all cases be assigned according to the rule above mentioned.

There is still another question which often arises. We have already said how unpleasantly the restriction to celebrate only one Mass in a day works at times when it happens that the demand for Masses is pretty brisk. It must often happen, then, that priests are obliged to send applicants away; for they are forbidden to undertake more Masses than they can hope to get through in a reasonable time, say a couple of months. But, now, suppose that a dead season occurs (or, perhaps, we should say, a season in which there are no deaths): cannot the priest make some provision beforehand for a time of future pressure; may he not say his daily Mass then, leaving the intention blank, and fill it up afterwards when the demand actually occurs. However convenient such a plan might be, it was found too likely to lead to abuses to be permitted; and the name of the person for whom the Mass is destined must be specified at the time, else it will be added to the general treasure of the Church. But if a priest, knowing that A. B. has lately died, and foreseeing that the friends of the deceased will come to order Masses for his repose—if the priest, knowing this, chooses to say Masses in anticipation, and take the money afterwards, he is at liberty to do so; only he does it at his own risk, and A. B. will get the benefit of the Masses, whether they are afterwards paid for or not.

Another case of constant occurrence is the following. In populous towns there is a constant demand for Masses and abundance of people willing to pay handsomely for them; while in secluded rural districts the priest may have his Masses almost entirely free, and be very glad to find any one ready to give even a small stipend for them,

Well, then, may the city priests undertake as many Masses as they can get, employing the rural priests to perform them for them, putting into their own pocket the difference between what they themselves actually receive and what their deputies are willing to take. This practice has been found to lead to abuses, and was forbidden by Pope Alexander VII. A hard battle was fought to obtain an exception for the case where the deputy priest was well aware of the whole transaction, and of his own full and free choice consented to accept a less sum than had been paid for the Mass. It was judged, however, that this giving up a part of his claim by the poorer priest would generally be done under a pressure which would hardly leave him a free agent in the matter; so that the practice has been altogether forbidden, with a few exceptions, into which we need not enter.

We speak as to the laws of the Church; but whether the practice in Roman Catholic countries corresponds even at this day we are less able to say with certainty. We remember some time ago meeting an account much to the purpose in a book called *Lorenzo Benoni*, which, possibly, some of our readers may have met with. The writer, who is an Italian, describes as existing in the town where he had been brought up (Genoa, if we remember right) what we may call a *Mass Exchange*—a well known place, where, in the morning, disengaged priests were to be met with, and where those who had undertaken more Masses than they could fulfil were sure to find a deputy. And he goes on to describe the unholy chaffering which usually took place on these occasions as to the price to be paid for their services. He tells us that when the priest who was willing to say the Mass found that he could not bring the purchaser to his terms, it was customary for him to clinch the matter by an expedient (somewhat like our own auctions, by inch of candle) for compelling the purchaser to make his bidding promptly. He used to send into the adjacent tavern for his morning draught of wine, and, naming the lowest sum he would accept, raise the vessel slowly to his lips. If his terms were not accepted before one drop of the liquor was swallowed, his fast would be broken, and, according to one of the most stringent of Church rules, no Mass could be celebrated that day.

We see no reason for rejecting this story, merely because such practices are forbidden, for forbidden things are often done; but it is right to mention that such bargaining and huxtering about Masses as that here described is condemned by the rules of the Church. This was one of the abuses which the Council of Trent endeavoured to put down, in one of the canons making provision for the establishment of a fixed tariff, and strictly forbidding all bargaining beforehand. The scale of payment is left to be fixed by the diocesan or by provincial synods; and, accordingly, varies at different times and in different countries. We remember many years ago hearing a story, which turned on this point, of an old man dying who had amassed a large sum of money by usury and other practices of questionable morality. Conscious that if he got his due he could not expect his stay in purgatory to be very short, he endeavoured to make the best provision he could for his comfort in that quarter, and his son, when at length he came into the estate, found it burdened with a most unconscionable amount of Masses to be provided. He made his inquiries; ascertained the tariff price of a Mass, and found to his dismay that there was no difference between the wholesale price and the retail, and that no reduction would be made for taking a quantity. While still unable to reconcile his mind to the formidable outlay to which he seemed compelled, he fortunately discovered that the tariff in Portugal was considerably lower than in Ireland; he ascertained that it was admitted on all hands that the Mass would have equal efficacy wherever said, the road to purgatory being as short from Lisbon as from Dublin; so he took the benefit of free trade and saved half his money; the Portuguese priests got the crowns, and the father, it is to be hoped, got the Masses.

We tell the tale as it was told to us; but, except to a purchaser on a very large scale, or to a very poor person, we imagine that the Irish tariff would not be very formidable. We do not know the exact sum, but we fancy it cannot exceed a shilling or two for each Mass. This is all that the buyer of the Mass *must* give, but he is at liberty to give more; and, in fact, it would be thought a very shabby thing in one who could afford it if he were to limit the priest to his legal minimum; hence, no doubt, arise temptations to the priest to put a little gentle pressure on the liberality of his flock, and, very probably, cases of abuse occur even at the present day; for among the decrees of the synod of Cashel, held in 1853, by the Roman Catholic Bishops, the decrees of which were printed for strictly private circulation among the priests; in the book of these decrees the uniformity of the Roman type is broken by a decree commended in italics to their peculiar attention, that, though they are at liberty to accept all that is freely given them by those for whom they offer, they are on no account to use exactions in order to force the people to pay more than is prescribed.

* We remember hearing, that some fifteen or sixteen years ago, dissatisfaction on this subject gave rise to agitation among the Roman Catholic laity, particularly in the west, for a revised tariff; and it was thought that one of the reasons why the priests encouraged O'Connell's monster meetings, which took place about that time, was to divert the attention of their flocks from an unpleasant topic.

by law or by the custom of the place.⁴ To return to the general history of the subject, the tariff was first instituted in order to fix a *maximum*, beyond which people should not be bound to pay unless they liked; but the question came also to be decided, whether it did not fix a *minimum* as well; in other words, whether priests were at liberty to take less. It would seem that in some dioceses great dissatisfaction was felt by some priests with the highly unprofessional conduct of their poorer brethren, who undersold them by accepting a lower sum than that fixed by the tariff. Their conduct was looked on in the same light as in the present day the guinea physicians regard the proceedings of the advertising five shilling doctors. The priests complained to their Bishop, the Bishop wrote to the congregation at Rome, that the conduct of the priests who said Masses so cheap caused the sacrifice to be held cheap (*vilesce*) in the estimation of the people; and, on the 16th July, 1689, received a decree authorizing him not only to fix the tariff as he had done, but also to insist that no priest should accept less.

The stringency of the rule, "no money, no Mass," comes out also very strongly in a discussion of Pope Benedict as to a regulation which he is very anxious to see carried out, of having at least one Mass said for every dead person when the body is brought into the Church. But the practical puzzle is, how to carry out this regulation in the case of a pauper. He does suggest, indeed, that if due exertion were made there might, perhaps, be found in the parish some well-to-do priest benevolent enough to say the Mass gratis; but if not, he advises that the funds should be used for this purpose which are collected in the boxes in chapels; and he suggests, also, that, as many hospitals pay for the funeral expenses of the paupers who die there, the Mass might fairly be included among the legitimate funeral expenses.

Our limits warn us that we must draw to a close, else there are many other questions raised and decided on which we have not touched. For example, suppose that I have undertaken more Masses than I can conveniently fulfil in a moderate time, and that I get another priest to help me, promising to do as much for him another time. I fulfil my bargain. But, suppose that he receives but the bare tariff price for his Masses and I received twice as much for mine: am I bound to share?

Another question, whether, if one priest employs another to say Masses for him, he is bound to pay him in money or may do so in commodities, is worth mentioning, because the case actually arose a few years ago. The Abbé Migne, whose praiseworthy exertions in printing new editions of the fathers and other theological works are well known, being anxious to circulate his publications among the country clergy whose finances did not permit of their laying out large sums in adding to their libraries, devised the plan of instituting himself a Mass-factor as it were. He undertook to receive orders for Masses, to be executed by his country subscribers, and keeping the money himself to send them down the value in his books. The plan was laid with the best intentions, and without any view to filthy lucre; but it was ultimately abandoned as likely to be a bad precedent.

Another question that arises is, whether confessors may impose as penance on those who confess to them the procuring a certain number of Masses to be said; and it has been ruled that the penance is a very good one, provided it be not the confessor that is to say the Masses; otherwise it looks too like a judge imposing a fine which is to go into his own pocket.

But we must at length bring these illustrations to a close. Our readers will see that we have endeavoured candidly to give the higher authorities of the Roman Catholic Church all the credit they deserve, and have enumerated the regulations which they have made from time to time to curb the rapacity of avaricious priests. But it is evident that the error is in endeavouring to regulate and keep in order a practice which they ought to have abolished altogether. Considering that in the Roman Catholic Church, as in our own, Bishops are not allowed to ordain unless there be a nomination to some appointment, and that so no priest is dependant for his maintenance on saying Masses; there is no practical reason why they should not make for the whole Church the rule which Ignatius Loyola made for the order of the Jesuits—viz., that none of his priests should receive money for saying Masses.

As for the best of the rules, of which we have given specimens in this article, what do they read like, but rules for the regulation of a market; rules to prevent dishonesty, and to ensure the purchasers fair value for their money. But would any one recognise in them rules for the regulation of the highest act of Christian worship. We, Protestants, as we have Scripture authority for doing, set a high value on intercessory prayer, and believe that the prayer of Christians for one another is both acceptable in God's sight and corroborative of the faith and love of those who pro-

fessed to *sell his prayers*—to pray for those who paid him, and for those only? We should think that the prayers would be of little value of one so ignorant of the whole spirit of our religion. And can we think that conduct can be laudable in the clergy which we should consider disgraceful to the humblest layman, or that what cannot be permitted in the case of ordinary intercessory prayer may be tolerated in the very highest act of Christian devotion? It is possible that some of our Roman Catholic readers may think that in writing on this subject our article has deviated into a lighter strain than the sacredness of the subject demands; and we honestly confess that in studying regulations, of which money is the end and theme, we constantly found it hard to remember that we were studying anything more than the orders of a board of trade for the regulation of a market, to compel fraudulent merchants to fulfil their engagements,⁵ and to prevent them from selling the same thing twice over. Can we be blamed if we have found it hard to remember, what the parties appear to have forgotten themselves, that the merchandise in which they trafficked was believed to be the very body and blood of our Saviour. We recommend it to the consideration of thoughtful Roman Catholics to reflect whether the theory and practice of their Church on this subject are consistent; and whether, supposing the doctrine of Transubstantiation to be true, it could be permissible to turn so awful a miracle into a mere source of revenue. And we think that the more they examine, the more inclined they will be to the opinion that money is at the root of the whole system; and that the torments of purgatory, and the power of Masses to allay them, would not have been so anxiously dilated on by the preachers of the middle ages if it were not that the money paid for these Masses formed an important part of the priestly revenues.

ST. CYPRIAN.

WE have already given our readers so many extracts from the writings of St. Cyprian in our present volume⁶ that but little more is necessary to complete the proof of the correctness of the summary which we gave⁷ of his opinions on the subject of the Papal Supremacy. Living as he did in the middle of the third century, before, as Dr. Newman would say, the Papacy "awoke" or was "developed," it would be unreasonable to expect more pointed or direct repudiations of such supreme authority in the Bishops of Rome. The allusion to Pope Stephen's arrogance in the 3rd Council of Carthage (supra, p. 29), and his epistle to Pompeius (supra, p. 2), demonstrate how vigorously Cyprian would have opposed any more direct assumption of such an authority. It only remains to show that when Pope Stephen did venture to publish his abuse against St. Cyprian and expel him from communion with the Church at Rome, such attempted excommunication only recoiled against himself, and neither had the least effect in altering Cyprian's opinions or in inducing other Churches to exclude him from their communion. The learned Mosheim, in his Commentaries on the affairs of the Christians prior to the time of Constantine the Great, thus accurately states what was done by Pope Stephen, and guards his readers against misconception upon the subject:—(p. 535, &c.)

"Stephen, with a view of prevailing on his Eastern brethren to abandon this erroneous practice (i.e., re-baptizing heretics), addressed to them a letter, but the attempt proved ineffectual; and upon finding that they were not to be brought over to his opinion, but persisted in defending their own, he excluded them from all *communion with himself and the Roman Church*. Those who maintain that these Asiatic Christians, and afterwards their African brethren, were excommunicated by Stephen from the Church at large, labour under a mistake. The Bishop of Rome had not at this period assumed to himself such a degree of consequence as to fancy that he was invested with the power of excommunicating people from the Church at large, neither did any of those whom he excluded from communion with his own individual Church conceive that they were thereby put entirely without the Christian pale. Opinions like these were the offspring of a much more recent period. Every Bishop, it is true, was, at the time of which we are speaking, at liberty to exclude from his own communion, and pronounce unworthy of fraternal association, any person whom he might judge, whether truly or mistakenly mattered not, to be contaminated by any very grievous error, or to have acted in any way inconsistent with the duty of a Christian teacher. But his judgment, in this respect, was not imperative or binding on others, every one being at liberty to use his own will in either following or rejecting it. This was the rule by which Cyprian acted, and by which Victor and Stephen,

⁴ Not always that; for we read that in the year 1723 the Augustine monks, Dominicans, Carmelites, and others, being involved in inextricable debt, in consequence of obligations to perpetual Masses which they had contracted, Pope Innocent XII. applied the sponge, and discharged all their arrears on condition of their saying one grand Mass annually for all their creditors.—See a memorial bearing date 28th Sept., 1763, pp. 15, 17, 20, cited from the Venetian state papers by De Potter, *Historie du Christianisme*, vol. v., p. 297.

⁵ This is in conformity with the Canon of the Council of Trent, sess. xxv., cap. iv., which provides, that when an institution is burdened with more Masses than it can fulfil, the Bishop shall arrange the matter according to his discretion, provided that a commemoration of the benefactor shall always be made. Thus, if we understand it right, is equivalent to giving the benefactor a fractional part of a Mass instead of the whole, which he had calculated on.

⁶ See Supra, pp. 1, 29, 94, 111.

⁷ Supra, p. 94.

⁸ Supra, p. 123, note 6.

successively Bishops of Rome, and the greater part of the other prelates of this period, acted. Those, therefore, who apply the term *excommunication* to this sort of private judgments or decrees, and, for example, represent Cyprian as having been *excommunicated* by Stephen, are guilty of a most egregious mistake, since there is certainly a most material difference between a Bishop excommunicating any one and merely excluding him from his own communion."

While, however, the extent of the excommunication of the Asiatic Bishops, and afterwards of Cyprian and the Africans, was very far from having the effect or extent of an interdict or excommunication in the Hildebrandine age of the full-grown Papacy, there can be no doubt whatever that Stephen, Bishop of Rome, *did all in his power* to anathematize and excommunicate both the Asiatics and Africans, because they differed from him in this point of ecclesiastical discipline.

We learn from the ecclesiastical historian Eusebius that this was the case, in the following passage of his 7th book:

"Dionysius of Alexandria, in writing to Pope Sixtus (or Xystus), Stephen's successor, on baptism, at the same time showing the opinion and decision passed by Stephen and the rest of the Bishops, makes the following remarks on Stephen:—'He had written before respecting Helenus and Firmilianus, and all those from Cilicia and Cappadocia and Galatia, and all the nations adjoining, that he would not have communion with them on this account, because they, said he, *re-baptized the heretics*.⁹ And, behold, I pray you, the importance of the matter. For, in reality, as I have ascertained, decrees have been passed in the greatest Councils of the Bishops, that those who come from the heretics are first to be instructed, and then are to be *washed* and purified from the filth of their old and impure leaven. And respecting all these things, I have sent letters entreating them.'¹⁰

The celebrated letter of Firmilian, which we have already given some extracts from (p. 2, supra), affords still more striking proofs of Pope Stephen's violence and want of charity. Firmilian was Bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia (a predecessor of St. Basil the Great, whose opinions a century after we discussed in our last number), and one of the most eminent prelates of his age, as is several times expressly stated by the historian Eusebius.¹¹

Firmilian and his colleagues in the East had, at a Council held at Iconium, decided for themselves the question of re-baptizing heretics, as he tells Cyprian distinctly in this letter, and as Dionysius of Alexandria also wrote to Philemon, as we learn also from Eusebius. "But," says Firmilian, "as a doubt was started concerning the baptism of those who, though they joined with the new prophets, yet seemed to acknowledge the same Father and Son with us, we assembled in considerable numbers at Iconium, and there we disputed this question at large, and upon the result of all we confirmed the opinion, that all baptisms were to be rejected which were celebrated out of the Church."

Dionysius of Alexandria, in his third epistle on baptism to Philemon, a presbyter of Rome, while he admits that he had received a contrary rule and form from the Blessed Pope (Papa) Heraclas, his predecessor in the See of Alexandria, goes on as follows:—"I have also understood, not only that this practice (i.e., re-baptism of heretics) was introduced by them of Africa, but that long since, during the times of those Bishops before us, in the most populous Churches, the same thing was decreed by the Councils of the brethren at Iconium and Synada."¹² To overturn their determinations, and to drive them into contention and strife, I cannot endure, &c."¹³

Firmilian's letter shows also that St. Cyprian and his colleagues had sent a special messenger, named Rogatian, to Cappadocia, in order to secure the sympathy of their Asiatic brethren, and had also sent special legates to Rome to endeavour to appease the rage of Stephen; but the latter only made matters worse.

Mosheim thus describes what happened:—

"The African Prelates conceived that no means ought to be left untried on their part to quiet the storm that had been raised, and they accordingly despatched a legation to Rome for the purpose of restoring things, if possible, to their former state. Orders were, however, issued by Stephen that the Bishops charged with this mission should not be received by any of the members of the Roman Church into their houses, inasmuch as they were to be regarded in the light of heretics, whom he had

⁹ Valesius, in his notes on Eusebius, p. 141, wishes to give a milder interpretation to this, under the idea that Stephen never actually broke off connection with the Asiatics, but merely threatened to do so. But Firmilian's epistle to Cyprian puts the matter beyond controversy, in which he never once bestows on Stephen the title of "brother," but treats him as an open adversary and an enemy. Towards the end of this epistle, he states in the plainest terms that it was not only against the African Prelates that Stephen had declared war, but that he had previously broken communion with many other Churches, and in particular those in the eastern parts. "Pacem cum singulis vario discordie genere rumpentem, modo cum orientalibus quod nec vos, laterem confidimus, modo vobiscum qui in meridie estis. p. 336. Quod nunc, Stephanus ausus est facere, rumpens adversus vos pacem, quam semper antecessores ejus vobiscum amore et honore mutuo custodierunt."—Cyp. Oper., p. 344, Ben. Ed., Venet., 1758.

¹⁰ Eusebius, lib. vii., ch. 5.

¹¹ Eusebius, Ecc. Hist., lib. vi., cc. 26-46, and lib. vii., cc. 5, 28, 30.

¹² Cyp. Oper., Ben. Ed., Epis. 75, p. 333.

¹³ Iconium was a town of Lycaonia, now Kunia; Synada, a city of Phrygia-Major, famous for its marble.

¹⁴ Eusebius, lib. vii., c. 7.